

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: P50-0080**REMARKS**

The applicant notes initially that the specification has been amended in response to the examiner's objection. To summarize the changes, the antenna is specified by number 20, while number 12 specifies the tire bead. Finally, number 22 refers to the insulating coating. Although there was admittedly some confusing language in the specification, this delineation was clear from original Figures 1 and 2.

The applicant has further amended claims 1-5, 7-9 and 16 (rather than claim 15 as pointed out by the examiner) in response to the examiner's objections. The applicant has also amended claims 2-5, 7-9 and 21 in response to the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The applicant disagrees with the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21 and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock in view of Kenison, Parylene Properties and Crawford. On page 3, the examiner points out that Mock teaches that the frequency of the electromagnetic carrier waves is between 4 and 100 kilohertz. The examiner further states that Mock points out that a "high frequency" such as 400-500 MegaHertz may be used. The reference to "high frequency" in Mock is confusing in that the "high frequency" range is known by one skilled in the art to be 3-30 MegaHertz, while they specifically mention 400-500 MegaHertz. In either case, however, our claims refer to a frequency range of 31-300 and greater than 500 MegaHertz, and thus do not touch any of the ranges of Mock.

The examiner further concedes on page 3 that Mock does not specifically recite the electrically insulating materials as having the specified properties, but claims it


ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: P50-0080

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Mock's antenna such that it is surrounded by electrically insulating material having the specified properties. Obviousness, however, can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Neither Kenison nor Parylene provide such a motivation. Moreover, while Crawford may provide some motivation for using carbon black reinforced rubber, it does not provide motivation for the use of the insulating material with the specific properties listed in the current invention.

The Applicant submits that Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21 and 23-27 are now in condition for Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/1/2006

  
Adam Arnold  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 55,979